



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/621,972	07/17/2003	Ross S. Tsugita	1001.1421103	2230
28075 7590 12/24/2009 CROMPTON, SEAGER & TUFTE, LLC 1221 NICOLLET AVENUE SUITE 800 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55403-2420				
EXAMINER				
BLATT, ERIC D				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3734				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/24/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/621,972

Applicant(s)

TSUGITA, ROSS S.

Examiner

Eric Blatt

Art Unit

3734

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 09 December 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 53-71 and 78-81.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 72-77.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Todd E Manahan/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3734

/E. B./
Examiner, Art Unit 3734

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: With regard to the new matter rejection, Applicant argues that the disclosure stating that a port may be positioned proximal to the occlusion balloon wherein the port communicates with an infusion lumen provides sufficient disclosure for the claimed feature of an infusion port within the proximal end region and proximal the balloon. The disclosure cited by Applicant does not describe an infusion port within the proximal end region.

With regard to the 103 rejection over Gray in view of Patel, Applicant argues that the combination relied upon in the outstanding office action fails to meet the limitation that the balloon and the first catheter shaft are configured to stop fluid outside of the first catheter shaft proximal to the balloon from flowing distally past the distal region of the shaft when the balloon is expanded. As discussed in the action, the balloon seals the lumen, thus preventing blood outside the catheter from flowing distally past the balloon. Although blood may perfuse into the catheter through a port proximal to the balloon, this blood is not outside the catheter as recited in the claims. Furthermore, as noted on page 5 of the outstanding office action, applicant has claimed a device having precisely such a port proximal to the balloon (shown in Figure 5 of Applicant's drawings) in combination with the language concerning blood flowing past the balloon. Clearly, Applicant must regard these features to be compatible with one another, or these features would not be claimed together.

Lastly, Applicant traverses Examiner's position that it would have been obvious to use the inner and outer sheaths of the modified device to deliver a self-expanding stent. Applicant concedes that it was well known to use self-expanding stents in combination with stent delivery systems having inner and outer sheaths, but submits that such a modification would not have been obvious for the device taught by Gray and Patel. Examiner sees no reason why this modification would not have been possible or would prevent the intended function of the Gray device. Further, use of inner and outer sheaths to deliver self-expanding stents was exceptionally well-known, and this modification would not have produced results that would have been unexpected to one of ordinary skill in the art. Examiner thus maintains the position that this modification would have been obvious.